

July 1, 1975

The Editor
The Boston Globe
Boston, Mass. 02100

Sir:

C
O
P
Y
An Associated Press story I have just received begins, "The Boston Globe reported Friday that radiation tests of bullet fragments involved in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy contain nothing to challenge the Warren Commission's conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone." Nowhere in this story of May 30, 1975, is there any reference to the fact that I am the litigant in the Freedom of Information lawsuit under which these tests results were, I think it is fairly safe to assume, leaked to you by a federal source so that you could report them in as gross a departure from traditional journalistic practice as I have seen in recent years.

AP does not quote you as giving your source. I have reason to believe you were fed it by the FBI by a specific agent whose name I have. I would welcome a denial. This might restore some of the respect I had for some of the fine things your paper has done.

You should know that about two months prior to your becoming a propaganda agent for the federal government - and I shall return to this - this story was offered to your Washington bureau which did not even bother to return the call. Your bureau was offered all the papers I had until then received.

I called your paper because I had heard it had developed an interest in the JFK assassination after a meeting of nuts and self-seekers at Boston College. I refused to attend because of the public record of its sponsors.

Your quoted story attributes to the tests what they cannot prove, "that Lee Harvey Oswald acted alone."

It attributes to the tests the story reports - a minor, incomplete and insignificant fraction of all necessary testing - what J. Edgar Hoover did not and would not. In fact, this language relating to a so-called found bullet as "similar in atomic composition to fragments from the wrist of then Texas Governor John Connally ..." raises questions but answers none. It actually can mean and strongly suggests that they were not, as proof requires, identical or even of common "composition," what other papers I have obtained separately indicate to be both the capability of that particular test and the evidentiary need in the language of the AEC.

There is other incredibly bad reporting that becomes partisanship from this language: "The Globe said the FBI test, now available to the public, does not contradict the commission's conclusion about the number of bullets fired, ..." Is there any conceivable way any scientific testing could, unless beyond possibility of doubt all fragments were recovered and 100 percent of the composition of all materials to be tested were tested?

The grossness of the dishonesty and the grossness of the propaganda become apparent in your failure to report that under date of April 10, which is a month and three weeks before you became a propagandist on this, FBI Director Clarence Kelley informed me in writing a) that he had supplied all the tests and b) they did not include the most basic of all required to be made by neutron activation.

This is directly contradicted by an FBI agent's affidavit filed in this case, Civil Action 226-75. In it I have charged perjury to the FBI without so much as a pro forma denial.

Most responsible papers prefer not to become the agents of official propaganda. One means by which they seek to avoid this is talking to all sides. You cannot be incompetent enough not to know there was another side, who it was and how to reach it, and the fact is I did leave a message that was never responded to.

Have you had access to all the tests? Why did you not report the incompleteness of the testing? Incomplete unless the head of the FBI is a liar, which an FBI affidavit means.

In nonresponse to my sworn allegation of official perjury and to my specific proof that evidence was still being withheld after sworn assurances it was not, the FBI told the court, "In a sense, plaintiff could make such claims ad infinitum since he is perhaps more familiar with events surrounding the investigation of President Kennedy's assassination than anyone now employed by the FBI."

I realize that the AP story is not identical with yours (of which I would welcome a copy), but unless it is totally false reporting yours is remarkably irresponsible, if not Orwellian, journalism. It prompts me to ask if you reported other of my recent endings of suppression under FOIA.

(This story actually makes it seem as though the government, purely out of dedication to openness, just decided to release all this stuff. The actuality is it resisted bitterly for a decade, forcing me all the way to the Supreme Court the first time and going through the motions only this time because that suit and the official corruption in it is one of the major causes of the amending of the law.)

Last November AP and UPI both carried A-wire stories on some pretty sordid Warren Commission illegally-classified, ~~top secret~~ executive session transcripts I got under the law. For May 18 use, AP had a story on still another. The first could hardly have been more explicit on CIA dishonesty or the second on the FBI's partisanship. If you carried either, especially because of the great disappointment in you this letter reflects, I would appreciate copies of them to leave with a copy of this letter in my files.

Aside from what is obvious in this kind of reporting, there is a factor I would like to believe would give you some concern. The government is again trying to rewrite the amended law in court and by corruption. This would not have been possible under the 1966 act had it not been for the total abdication, including of normal reporting, by the major press. Intentionally or otherwise, you are helping.

C
O
P
Y

-3-

It is a sad day for freedom of the press and for freedom of information when battles of this nature have to be waged by one entirely without means so that the wealthy major media can fulfill its responsibilities by being able to obtain access to information. It is a sadder day when these unassisted efforts are treated as you did treat mine in this case.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

C
O
P
Y